Mr. Balakrishna Rao.—Lantana in Government lands should first be cleared. (Many of the members spoke to the same effect.)

Mr. Thammayya however opposed the motion on the ground that lantana when burnt is valuable as manure and that the law would be difficult to enforce.

Reply of Government.—The question will be carefully investigated. The Agricultural Committee will take up the subject.

SUBJECT No. 13.

A Regulation to prevent usury.

Messrs. Chennabasappa and Volahatti Devappa, Gundlupet Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Money-lenders levy usurious rates of interest on the money they advance to the poor raiyats. A Regulation may be passed directing that Civil Courts should disallow interest in such cases.

Mr. C. Srinivasa Rao.—Such a law is in force in Travancore.

Reply of Government.—Not expedient.

JUDICIAL.

(*Nos. 14—42.*)

SUBJECT No. 14.

Extradition warrants under the Breach of Contract Act.

Messrs. B. Kesavaiya, and T. B. Mallegowda, Chikmagalur Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Reciprocity in the matter of Extradition under the Breach of Contract Act between Mysore and the British Provinces may be secured. It is very difficult to get labour in the coffee estates. Maistries take advance from a number of employers and run away to the adjoining British Territory and unless the offence under the Breach of Contract Act is made extraditable, it would be practically impossible to take any action against the maistries.

Reply of Government.—Noted.

SUBJECT No. 15.

Separation of judicial and executive functions.

Messrs. (1) B. Narasinga Rao and V. Rangaswami Iyengar, Seringapatam Taluk;

(2) C. Vasudeva Rao, Chikmagalur Taluk;

(3) Shama Rao, S. R. Balakrishna Rao, and K. Shankaranarayana Rao, Shimoga Taluk; P. Venkappayya, Abdul Aziz Saheb, and Lakshmayya, Shimoga Municipality;

and (4) H. Nanjundayya, Bangalore Law Association and Marige Hanumanthappa, Anekal Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—(1) Separation of the judicial and the executive functions of the Amildars is desirable and the reform may be effected at an early date.

(2) Two taluks may be clubbed together and the Revenue work may be entirely given to one Amildar and the Judicial work to another who will be the Magistrate.

(3) To begin with, Taluk Amildars may be relieved of their magisterial work and stationary magistrates appointed for groups of two taluks with powers to hold courts alternately in the two taluk headquarters.

(4) To give some relief to the Amildars whose work is very heavy a Sub-Magistrate may be appointed for each taluk as in the Madras Presidency.

Mr. B. Narasinga Rao.—A Committee may be appointed to consider the question. There will not be much financial difficulty and even if some extra cost has

to be incurred, it should not be grudged as the measure will be of great benefit to the public.

Mr. A. Ramanna.—The scheme should not end in the appointment of Sub-Magistrates. The system has proved a failure in Madras. Munsiff Magistrates may be appointed. Appeals should lie to Sub-Judges. Some of the Munsiffs may also be appointed First Class Magistrates. Appeals from First Class Magistrates should lie to Sessions Judges. The number of Assistant Commissioners may be reduced and the savings may be utilised to meet the extra cost.

Mr. Balakrishna Rao.—Stationary Magistrates with high salaries may be appointed for two or three taluks. Munsiffs should not be appointed Magistrates. There is no objection to Assistant Commissioners having magisterial powers. Objection is to the combination of Police and Judicial powers. Amildars may be divested of magisterial powers.

Mr. C. Vasudeva Rao.—Magistrates may be appointed for groups of two taluks and Amildars may be similarly appointed for revenue and other work.

Reply of Government.—Under consideration.

SUBJECT No. 16.

Copying paper.

Messrs. (1) S. Suryanarayana Setty and P. Suryanarayana Setty, Arkalgud Taluk, Sura Sastry, Chikballapur Taluk; Surappa, Bangalore Taluk, H. Nanjundayya, Bangalore Law Association, Adinarayanayya, Doddballapur Taluk, Puttanna, Doddballapur, Municipality, C. R. Nanjundayya and A. Gundappa, Channapatna Taluk, and Viswanatha Setti, Channapatna Municipality, and (2) Singri Nanjappa, Tiptur Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—(1) The price of copying paper is high and it has not enough space for the number of words which could be copied according to the old rules. The price of the copying paper may be reduced and both sides of the paper may be allowed to be written upon.

(2) The value of a sheet may be reduced to one anna.

Reply of Government.—The matter requires further consideration.

SUBJECT No. 17.

Improvement of the efficiency and morale of the Police force.

Messrs. B. Narasinga Rao and V. Rangaswami Iyengar, Seringapatam Taluk; Vamana Rao, Nagar Taluk and R. Gopalaswamy Iyer, Bangalore District Board, Katte Channakeshaviah, Siddappa and Shankarappa, Tirthahalli Taluk.

Note.—Not taken up for discussion.

SUBJECT No. 18.

First Appellate Court for the Bangalore Division.

Mr. Sura Sastri, Chikballapur Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—As great inconvenience is now experienced by the civil litigants for want of a First Appellate Court for the districts of Kolar, Tumkur and Bangalore, the District Court of the Bangalore Division may be invested with the necessary powers.

Under the present arrangement, parties are put to great expenditure in the shape of costs. Moreover, when the other two District Courts have appellate powers, it is